

REMARKS

This paper responds to the office action issued on September 1, 2010. Claims 24 and 40 are amended and claims 31-39 are cancelled. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of these amendments and the following remarks.

Independent claims 24 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiimori (U.S. 7,010,587) in view of Adler (U.S. 7,155,672). The applicant respectfully disagrees. Nonetheless, claims 24 and 40 are amended for clarity and to further distinguish from the cited references.

Independent claim 24 recites the steps of comparing font identifiers in received text data with the fonts in a capabilities list of a designated device to determine the font identifiers for which the designated device lacks font structure data, and then transferring the lacking font structure data and the text data to the designated device. Similarly, independent claim 40 recites the steps of determining which of the text data's font identifiers is not found in the designated devices font capabilities list, requesting and receiving these identifiers, and then transferring both the text data and the font structure data to the designated device. In addition, claims 24 and 40 have been amended to clarify that the font structure data and the text data are included in the same electronic data transfer. This is not disclosed or suggested by either of the cited Shiimori or Adler references.


The Office Action acknowledges that the Shiimori reference fails to teach transmitting the lacking font data to the designated device, and relies on the Adler reference for this claim element. However, the Adler reference does not suggest transmitting both the missing font data structure and the text data in the same electronic data transfer. Adler teaches transmitting glyph sub-sets to an electronic device in order to display electronic content on the device. However, in

Adler's system, the glyph sub-sets are requested by the electronic device only after it has already received the electronic content. This is illustrated in Figs. 2 and 3 of the Adler reference. Specifically, in Adler's system, an intermediate device receives a request for electronic content from the electronic device and then scans the electronic content to identify one or more sets of glyphs needed to display the electronic content. The intermediate device then modifies the electronic content to add directives that identify the one or more needed sets of glyphs, and sends this modified electronic content to the electronic device. (See, Adler, Fig. 2.) Then, after receiving the modified electronic content, the electronic device sends a request to the intermediate device for the one or more sets of glyphs, and the requested glyphs are sent from the intermediate device to the electronic device. (See, Adler, Fig. 3). In other words, Adler teaches sending the electronic content and the glyphs in separate electronic data transfers.

Accordingly, the combination of Shiimori and Adler would not lead the person skilled in the art to the methods recited independent claims 24 and 40, where the lacking font structure data and the text data are included in the same electronic data transfer. For at least this reason, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 24 and 40, along with their respective dependent claims, are patentable over the cited references and are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY



Joseph M. Sauer (Reg. No. 47,919)
Jones Day
North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-7506